

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 25, and 26 are pending in this application. Applicants assert that these claims are in condition for allowance after final.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat 7,286,878 to Stypulkowski in view of U.S. Pat. 6,141,588 to Cox. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “a first lead coupled to the central control module that comprises at least one connector, the first lead carrying power from the power source and digital communications including the programming signals from the wireless receiver.” Claim 1 further recites “a satellite module ... comprising a processor coupled to said wireless receiver by the first lead and the processor configured to be coupled to the power source by the first lead, a communication module coupled to said processor for communicating with said central control module by the first lead....” Claim 1 additionally recites “wherein said processor is configured to receive said programming signals from said wireless receiver over the first lead....”

Applicants asserted that Stypulkowski fails to disclose at least these recitations in the prior response. The present Office Action has agreed but has introduced Cox to show a planet providing electromagnetic energy to a satellite to allow the satellite to recharge a battery. The Office Action then concludes that Stypulkowski as modified by Cox renders claim 1 as obvious.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the combination of Stypulkowski and Cox meets these recitations of claim 1. The Office Action relies on the disclosure of Cox regarding the provisioning of power from a control module to a satellite module. However, Cox is specifically about providing electromagnetic energy which is a propagating wireless wave that must be received by a transceiver 222 and antenna 223 combination of the satellite and

converted to electrical energy to recharge the battery. This is evident from col. 11, lines 5-7 of Cox.

Thus, for the sake of argument and without conceding the point, even if it would be proper to modify Stypulkowski by the disclosure of Cox regarding providing electromagnetic energy via wireless transfer to an antenna and transceiver in the satellite, such a modification entirely omits the first lead from carrying power as recited in claim 1. Rather than transferring power via the first lead, the power transfer in the proposed combination would occur wirelessly via electromagnetic energy being received by the antenna and transceiver of the satellite as disclosed in Cox.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Stypulkowski and Cox fails to meet the recitations of claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable. Dependent claims 4, 5, and 7-10 depend from an allowable base claim and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites “the elongated conductor carrying power from the power source and digital communications including the programming signals from the wireless receiver..., the satellite control module being configured to generate and selectively route electrical signals through the plurality of leads to selected ones of the plurality of tissue-interactive elements in accordance with the programming signals received from the remote programmer through the elongated conductor.”

Applicants asserted that Stypulkowski fails to disclose at least these recitations and particularly the elongated conductor carrying power from the power source in the previous response. The Office Action agreed but introduced the Cox reference to address this deficiency of Stypulkowski.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the combination of Stypulkowski and Cox meets these recitations of claim 25. The Office Action relies on the disclosure of Cox regarding the provisioning of power from a central control module to a satellite control module. However, Cox is specifically about providing electromagnetic energy which is a propagating wireless wave that must be received by a transceiver 222 and antenna 223 combination of the satellite

and converted to electrical energy to recharge the battery. This is evident from col. 11, lines 5-7 of Cox.

Thus, for the sake of argument and without conceding the point, even if it would be proper to modify Stypulkowski by the disclosure of Cox regarding providing electromagnetic energy via wireless transfer to an antenna and transceiver in the satellite, such a modification entirely omits the elongated conductor from carrying power as recited in claim 25. Rather than transferring power via the elongated conductor that is between the central control module and the satellite control module as in claim 25, the power transfer would occur wirelessly via electromagnetic energy being received by the antenna and transceiver of the satellite as disclosed in Cox. Accordingly, Stypulkowski as modified by Cox fails to meet the recitations of claim 25.

Claim 25 and dependent claim 26 are allowable over Stypulkowski in view of Cox for at least these reasons.

Claim 26

Furthermore, claim 26 recites wherein the electrical signals are produced within the satellite control module from the power received through the elongated conductor. Applicants assert that Stypulkowski in view of Cox also fails to disclose these recitations such that claim 26 is allowable for at least these additional reasons. In Stypulkowski, the wave shapers of the extension unit receive via the input lines 302, 303, and 304 stimulation pulses that have been created within the IPG. These stimulation pulses are shaped to provide signals to the electrodes. The wave shaping is said to be changing the voltage, frequency, or polarity.

Thus, the stimulation pulses themselves are generated within the IPG rather than the extension unit and are therefore produced by power within the IPG rather than being produced at the extension unit from power received over an elongated conductor. The wave shapers, by changing the voltage, frequency, or polarity, are shaping the waves but are not generating waves from power received from the controller over an elongated conductor. Thus, claim 26 is allowable over Stypulkowski in view of Cox for at least these additional reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as all rejections have been overcome. Early notice of allowability is kindly requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at 770.643.8913 with any questions or comments.

While no fees are believed due beyond those already paid, please grant any extension of time, if necessary for entry of this paper, and charge any fee due for such extension or any other fee required in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 13-2546.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2011

/Jeramie J. Keys /
Jeramie J. Keys, 42,724
On behalf of:

MEDTRONIC, INC.
710 Medtronic Parkway NE, M.S.: LC340
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55432-5604
Telephone: (763) 505-0405
Facsimile: (763) 505-0411
CUSTOMER NO.: 27581